

Municipal Clerk's Office  
**Amended and Approved**  
Date: February 2, 2024

Submitted by: Assembly Vice Chair Zaletel  
Assembly Chair Constant  
Assembly Member Kevin Cross  
Prepared by: Legislative Services  
Reviewed by: Assembly Counsel's Office  
For reading: February 2, 2024

**ANCHORAGE, ALASKA**  
**AR No. 2024-40, As Amended**

1 **A RESOLUTION OF THE ANCHORAGE ASSEMBLY SUBMITTING PUBLIC**  
2 **COMMENT ON THE DRAFT FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAM FOR THE**  
3 **EKLUTNA HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT.**  
4

---

5 **WHEREAS**, the Municipality of Anchorage, Chugach Electric Association (CEA),  
6 and Matanuska Electric Association (MEA) (collectively “the Hydroelectric Project  
7 Owners”) jointly own the Eklutna Hydroelectric Project and are parties to the 1991  
8 Fish and Wildlife Agreement (the “1991 Agreement”) with the State of Alaska, the  
9 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service (an  
10 agreement that notably excludes a key stakeholder, the Native Village of Eklutna,  
11 the federally recognized tribe whose ancestral homelands encompass this project)  
12 to fund studies to examine and quantify the impacts of the Eklutna Power Project on  
13 fish and wildlife; examine and develop proposals for the protection, mitigation, and  
14 enhancement of fish and wildlife affected by such hydroelectric development; and  
15 prepare a Proposed Final Fish and Wildlife Program (the “Fish and Wildlife  
16 Program”) for approval by the Governor; and  
17

18 **WHEREAS**, once approved by the Governor, the Fish and Wildlife Program will  
19 contractually bind operations of the Eklutna Hydroelectric Project and Anchorage  
20 Water and Wastewater Utility (“AWWU”) for the next 35 years; and  
21

22 **WHEREAS**, in their Draft Fish and Wildlife Program to mitigate their impacts to fish  
23 and wildlife pursuant to the 1991 Agreement, the Hydroelectric Project Owners  
24 propose to utilize AWWU infrastructure to deliver water into the Eklutna River via a  
25 Portal Valve (the “Portal Valve Alternative”) one mile downstream of Eklutna Lake;  
26 and  
27

28 **WHEREAS**, the policy of the Municipality of Anchorage has been to support  
29 restoration of the Eklutna River since the Anchorage Assembly adopted AR 2017-  
30 324(S), “A Resolution in Support of Efforts to Restore the Eklutna River,” and AR  
31 2022–262, As Amended, “A Resolution of the Anchorage Municipal Assembly in  
32 Support of Efforts to Restore the Eklutna River”; and  
33

34 **WHEREAS**, further, through the passage of AO 2023-131, As Amended, the  
35 Assembly, through the creation of a specific law, reinforced and declared that it is  
36 the official policy of the Municipality of Anchorage, inclusive of the Anchorage  
37 Hydropower Utility Department, to restore the continuous water flow of the Eklutna  
38 River and the fish populations of the River and Eklutna Lake, to the greatest extent  
39 possible, subject to all provisions of the 1991 Agreement; and  
40

1 **WHEREAS**, any changes to the Eklutna Hydroelectric Project will impact not only  
2 hydroelectric power and drinking water, but also fish and wildlife; and  
3

4 **WHEREAS**, Eklutna Lake is the primary source of Municipality's drinking water for  
5 which AWWU currently pays approximately \$1.2 Million annually to the Eklutna  
6 Hydroelectric Project to ensure access to the Municipality's drinking water and any  
7 binding agreement relating to the purchase price of water and volumes available to  
8 AWWU may impact property rights of AWWU and the regulated price of water to its  
9 customers; and  
10

11 **WHEREAS**, the Anchorage Assembly was recently briefed about the changing  
12 regulatory environment for drinking water, and while the effects of the regulatory  
13 changes are currently unknown, concern has been raised about the availability of  
14 drinking water from ground wells under the new regulations; and  
15

16 **WHEREAS**, the Anchorage Assembly hired an expert engineer, Don Spiegel, who  
17 originally designed the Eklutna AWWU system, to evaluate the Portal Valve  
18 alternative as it relates to AWWU's operation of the Eklutna Water Treatment Facility  
19 and the effectiveness of the Portal Valve Alternative in delivering water to the river  
20 to support the restoration of fish species; and  
21

22 **WHEREAS**, the initial conclusions of Mr. Spiegel, which were submitted to the  
23 Assembly through AIM 2024-11 on January 23, 2024, raise significant doubts as to  
24 whether the Portal Valve Alternative will meet the mitigation objectives stated on a  
25 year round basis: inability to meet those objectives could result in AWWU and the  
26 Municipality being culpable and liable for the death of any in-river species that have  
27 returned, depending on water levels provided by the Hydroelectric Project Owners,  
28 and could be a limiting condition for AWWU expansion in the future; and  
29

30 **WHEREAS**, the public comment period for the Draft Fish and Wildlife Program is  
31 open until February 19, 2024; and  
32

33 **WHEREAS**, following the public comment period is an opportunity for the  
34 Hydroelectric Project Owners to review the comments and resolve any  
35 disagreements prior to submitting a final proposal to the Governor; and  
36

37 **WHEREAS**, the Native Village of Eklutna has put forward an alternative for removal  
38 of the dam at Eklutna Lake, which is supported by the Municipal policy stated in AO  
39 2023-131, As Amended, and codified at AMC 26.30.025A., but was never fully  
40 considered by the Hydroelectric Project Owners and has not been presented as an  
41 alternative in the Draft Fish and Wildlife Program; and  
42

43 **WHEREAS**, in addition to the stated policy and support for dam removal, the  
44 Anchorage Assembly has evaluated the Portal Valve Alternative and has concerns  
45 about that alternative; and  
46

47 **WHEREAS**, in the interest of protecting the future of the Municipal water supply as  
48 well as the interests of its residents and municipal taxpayers, the Anchorage  
49 Assembly submits the following public comments on the Draft Fish and Wildlife  
50 Program regarding the Portal Valve Alternative;

1  
2 **NOW, THEREFORE, THE ANCHORAGE ASSEMBLY RESOLVES and submits**  
3 **the following as its comments on the Draft Fish and Wildlife Program:**  
4

5 **Section 1.** The following are process and technical concerns particular to the  
6 Portal Valve Alternative put forward by the Hydroelectric Project Owners for public  
7 comment:  
8

- 9 A. **Non-Compliant Process.** The August 7, 1991 Fish and Wildlife  
10 Agreement (1991 Agreement) sets forth a process for addressing the  
11 Eklutna Hydroelectric Project's impacts on fish and wildlife similar to  
12 that for Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") licensed  
13 projects. The process set forth in the 1991 Agreement was intended  
14 to be at least as robust as a normal FERC license process, which is  
15 subject to all the provisions of National Environmental Policy Act  
16 ("NEPA") and all the authorities typically granted to the federal  
17 agencies. The process engaged by the Hydroelectric Project Owners  
18 falls short of the FERC standard of analysis. No NEPA analysis was  
19 done, the federal agencies were denied the authorities they normally  
20 would have, such as to prescribe fish passage, and the public wasn't  
21 presented any alternatives to choose from. Moreover, the process  
22 engaged in does not appear comparable to the NEPA requirements to  
23 consult with Native Tribes impacted by the project (18 C.F.R. 5.7), nor  
24 have a dispute resolution process allowing agencies to mandate  
25 conditions (18 C.F.R. 5.8 and 5.15).  
26

27 None of state or federal signatories to the 1991 Agreement have so  
28 far supported the Portal Valve Alternative. The comment letters from  
29 these state and federal resource agencies raise questions around the  
30 process engaged by the Hydroelectric Project Owners, the data inputs  
31 used in modeling to develop the Draft Fish and Wildlife Program, and  
32 the viability of the Portal Valve Alternative to achieve the stated goals  
33 of the 1991 Agreement. These questions are unresolved.  
34

35 Similarly, the process under the 1991 Agreement diverges  
36 substantially from the type of alternatives analysis the Municipality  
37 uses on its own capital projects. Often the Municipality's own large  
38 capital projects, such as the Port of Alaska Modernization Program  
39 ("PAMP") or projects co-funded through the Anchorage Metropolitan  
40 Area Transportation Solutions ("AMATS") design alternatives, are  
41 evaluated by experts and relevant stakeholders and the Assembly is  
42 briefed and able to weigh in on the proposed alternatives, particularly  
43 where Municipal resources are required to fund the projects. Based  
44 on the information the Assembly has been provided to date, only one  
45 alternative was seriously evaluated by the Hydroelectric Project  
46 Owners and put forward for consideration even though a Municipal  
47 contribution is expected through a property tax assessment.  
48

- 49 B. **Potential Impacts to Anchorage Drinking Water.** Throughout this  
50 process, there has been very little discussion about any implications

1 on AWWU and the Municipality's access to drinking water now and  
2 into the foreseeable future (the next 35 years). The week of January  
3 22, 2024, well after the Draft Fish and Wildlife Program was released  
4 and after years of discussion and presentation by the Eklutna  
5 Hydroelectric Project owners, we learned that the Hydroelectric  
6 Project Owners and AWWU, all public utilities regulated by the  
7 Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA), had signed a binding  
8 agreement in early October 2023, prior to submitting the Draft Fish  
9 and Wildlife Program for public comment. We learned this agreement  
10 is based on the Portal Valve Alternative and no other alternative; an  
11 alternative that may have significant impacts to the project outcome  
12 as well as to regulated rates authorized by the RCA. The Anchorage  
13 Assembly has requested a copy of the signed agreement, but we have  
14 been told the agreement is confidential and **could only review it in**  
15 **Executive Session [we therefore have been unable to review it.]**  
16 This is a significant hinderance on the Anchorage Assembly, and the  
17 public, to provide complete comments on the Portal Valve Alternative  
18 as related to AWWU operations, potential impacts to Municipal growth  
19 and strategic investments for AWWU and the Municipality. Significant  
20 legal questions also remain whether a binding agreement can be  
21 signed relating to future Municipal utility assets, revenues, and  
22 expenditures without Assembly approval.

23  
24 Before learning of that agreement, the Anchorage Assembly hired an  
25 expert to analyze the effectiveness of the Portal Valve option in  
26 relation to AWWU's operation at Eklutna. That analysis by engineer  
27 Don Spiegel, who designed the Eklutna AWWU system, concluded  
28 that the Portal Valve "cannot provide adequate Eklutna River  
29 restoration flows, nor can it provide year-round water without  
30 interruption. Thus, it is the Author's opinion that the Portal Valve as  
31 currently configured is fatally flawed and other Eklutna River  
32 restoration alternatives should be studied further."

33  
34 Furthermore, in the past month, AWWU has briefed the Assembly on  
35 new developments concerning drinking water regulation through  
36 federal and local entities. The impacts of the new drinking water  
37 regulations are yet to be determined, but AWWU leadership has  
38 expressed concerns about potential impacts to the Municipality from  
39 limitations of retaining full ground well capacity. Until the new  
40 regulatory landscape is better understood, particularly any reductions  
41 in access to drinking water from sources other than Eklutna, any future  
42 limitations on drinking water capacity at Eklutna should be held in  
43 abeyance.

- 44  
45 C. **Incomplete Analysis and Insufficient Mitigation.** The Portal Valve  
46 Alternative does not meet the requirements of the 1991 Agreement  
47 regarding "the protection, mitigation of damages to, and enhancement  
48 of fish and wildlife affected by hydroelectric development of the  
49 Eklutna Hydroelectric Project." There are a number of variables  
50 related to lake level that can render the Portal Valve Alternative

1 inoperable. Additionally, regular and unexpected maintenance at the  
2 AWWU water facility will also stop the flow of water into the Portal  
3 Valve. Discontinuous water flows will result in fish kills in Eklutna  
4 River. The state and federal signatories to the 1991 Agreement have  
5 raised questions about the analysis and process used to develop the  
6 Draft Fish and Wildlife Program. The Hydroelectric Project Owners  
7 failed to consider all reasonable alternatives, including the dam  
8 removal alternative proposed by the Native Village of Eklutna. The  
9 Hydroelectric Project Owners failed to present the public with a full  
10 range of alternatives as would typically occur in similar situations.

11  
12 D. **Poor Coordination and Questionable Use of Public Funds.** The  
13 Hydroelectric Project Owners and AWWU are regulated utilities and  
14 need to demonstrate benefit to their rate payers. Additionally, the  
15 Assembly, as the steward of taxpayer funds, must demonstrate benefit  
16 to the residents of the Municipality through the expenditure of public  
17 funds. Treating the Portal Valve Alternative as a singular stand-alone  
18 project is short sighted and does not maximize various opportunities  
19 to meet the goals and objectives of 1991 Agreement across various  
20 entities nor does it meet the requirements of these entities to benefit  
21 the public. The Portal Valve Alternative brought forward by the  
22 Hydroelectric Project Owners is self-serving and fails to protect the  
23 broader public interests of the Municipality of Anchorage. Given the  
24 \$57 million price tag of the Portal Valve Alternative, its potential  
25 impacts to AWWU operations, and the financial implications to  
26 ratepayers and taxpayers for the next 35 years, we find this is a poor  
27 use of public funds and lacked public coordination.

28  
29 **For all the above reasons, the Anchorage Assembly cannot endorse**  
30 **and thus opposes the Draft Fish and Wildlife Program.**

31  
32 **Section 2.** The Municipality of Anchorage does not intend to issue  
33 authorizations or provide funds or any other form of support of the Draft Fish and  
34 Wildlife Program or any alternative that doesn't restore the full length of the Eklutna  
35 River and comply with policy of the Municipality, as recently enacted by AO 2023-  
36 131, As Amended, and codified at AMC 26.30.025A., as well as AR 2022-262, As  
37 Amended, and AR 2017-324(S).

38  
39 **Section 3.** The Regulatory Commission of Alaska (RCA), under its statutory  
40 powers to initiate investigation into practices and facilities of a public utility, should  
41 review the Draft Fish and Wildlife Program and examine any impacts on any of the  
42 regulated utilities, including but not limited Chugach Electric, Matanuska Electric,  
43 Anchorage Hydropower and AWWU, particularly about impacts to rate payers and  
44 their access to uninterrupted service, **before** any option for a Final Fish and Wildlife  
45 Program is transmitted to the Governor for review and approval.

46  
47 **Section 4.** The Anchorage Assembly requests the Hydroelectric Project Owners  
48 to seek a two-year extension of the 1991 Agreement from the signatories, of which  
49 the Municipality is one through the Anchorage Hydropower Utility, to perform  
50 additional analysis, consultation, and coordination with affected parties, including

1 the Anchorage Assembly and the Native Village of Eklutna. The issues at play are  
2 too significant to our community to rush to judgment or exclude key stakeholders.  
3 The residents of the Municipality deserve a measured and comprehensive approach  
4 guided by respectful coordination to reach a solution that enjoys broad consensus  
5 among the affected parties.

6  
7 **Section 5.** This resolution shall be effective immediately upon passage and  
8 approval by the Assembly.

9  
10 PASSED AND APPROVED by the Anchorage Assembly this 2nd day of February,  
11 2024.

12  
13  
14  
15  
16 ATTEST:



Chair

17  
18  
19 

20  
21 Municipal Clerk